

**REMARKS**

**Summary**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, 13, 16, 17 and 20-22 stand in this application. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 23 and 24 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 10, 16 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

Although Applicant disagrees with the broad grounds of rejection set forth in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 16 and 22 to facilitate prosecution on the merits. Support for the above amendments can be found in the specification at least at paragraph [0043].

**Examiner Interview**

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Li for conducting a telephone interview with Applicants' representative on May 27, 2008. During the interview, Examiner Li and Applicants' representative discussed the independent claims, the applied reference, and the grounds of rejection. The substance of the interview is reflected by the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**35 U.S.C. § 102**

At page 2, paragraph 4 of the Office Action claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, 13, 16, 17 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by US 5,212,777 to Gove et al. ("Gove"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must teach every element of the claim. *See MPEP § 2131*, for example. Applicant submits that Gove fails to teach each and every element recited in claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, 13, 16, 17 and 20-22 and thus they define over Gove. For example, with respect to claim 1, Gove fails to teach, among other things, the following language:

the configuration information received on each clock cycle from one or more of the control units.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 defines over Gove.

Applicant respectfully submits that Gove, arguably, teaches a multi-processor reconfigurable architecture in SIMD and MIMD modes. More particularly, Applicant submits that Gove teaches a processor structured with several individual processors each having a communication link to several memories and a crossbar switch to allow operation in either SIMD or MIMD mode. By way of contrast, the claimed subject matter teaches “the configuration information received on each clock cycle from one or more of the control units.” Applicant respectfully submits that he has been unable to locate any teaching in Gove directed to the above recited language of amended independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 defines over Gove. Consequently, Gove fails to disclose all the elements or features of the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 2, 5, 8 and 9, which

depend from claim 1 and, therefore, contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from Gove.

Claims 10, 16 and 22 have been amended to recite features similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10, 16 and 22 are not anticipated and are patentable over Gove for reasons analogous to those presented with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 10, 16 and 22. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 13, 17 and 20-21 that depend from claims 10 and 16 respectively, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from Gove.

### Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, 13, 16, 17 and 20-22 recite novel features not shown by the cited references. Further, Applicant submits that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results not recognized by the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to

Appl. No. 10/813,790  
Response Dated July 8, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2008

be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

It is believed that claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, 13, 16, 17 and 20-22 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-9338 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

/John F. Kacvinsky/

John F. Kacvinsky, Reg. No. 40,040  
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: July 8, 2008

KACVINSKY LLC  
C/O Intelleivate  
P.O. Box 52050  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(724) 933-5529